

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/709,672	05/21/2004	James W. Adkisson	BUR920040002US1	3671	
23550	7590 12/04/2006		EXAMINER		
HOFFMAI	N WARNICK & D'ALE	MERANT, GUERRIER			
75 STATE S	STREET		-		
14TH FLOO	)R	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
ALBANY,	NY 12207	2138			
		DATE MAILED: 12/04/2006			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicatio	n No.	Applicant(s)	•		
Office Action Summary		10/709,67	2	ADKISSON ET AL.			
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		Guerrier M		2138			
Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communicated Reply	ition appears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ac	ldress		
WHICH - Extens after S - If NO p - Failure Any re	PRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAI sions of time may be available under the provisions of X (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this community to reply within the set or extended period for reply will ply received by the Office later than three months after a patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	LING DATE OF TH 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no ever ication. ory period will apply and will I. by statute, cause the appli	IS COMMUNICATION  nt, however, may a reply be tim  expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to become AB ANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status		•					
1) 🛛 F	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <i>05/21/04</i> .					
,	•	)⊠ This action is no	on-final.				
,							
• —	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition	on of Claims		·				
4) 🗍 (	Claim(s) is/are pending in the a	pplication.					
,	a) Of the above claim(s) is/are		sideration.				
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		-				
6) 🗌 (	Claim(s) is/are rejected.			-			
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) 🗌 (	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	on and/or election re	quirement.				
Application	on Papers						
9)□ T	The specification is objected to by the l	Examiner.					
	The drawing(s) filed on 05/21/04 is/are		b) objected to by th	e Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including th				FR 1.121(d).		
11) 🗌 T	he oath or declaration is objected to b	y the Examiner. No	te the attached Office	Action or form P	TO-152.		
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119	•					
-	Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo ☐ All b)	r foreign priority und	ler 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	)-(d) or (f).			
/-	1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
;	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
;	3. Copies of the certified copies of				l Stage		
	application from the Internationa	al Bureau (PCT Rule	: 17.2(a)).				
* S	ee the attached detailed Office action	for a list of the certif	ied copies not receive	ed.			
	•						
Attachment							
	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC	<b>1.948</b> \	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) 🔯 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date <u>20040521;20040706</u> .	, 540)	5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/709,672

Art Unit: 2138

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This is the initial office action based on the application filed on May 21, 2004. Claims 1-20 are currently pending and have been considered below.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morioka et al. (US 6,611,728) and further in view of Gillenwater et al. (US 6,557,115).

Claims 1, 9, 10,15 and 18-20: Morioka et al. discloses a defect table that associates previously studied features with known failures (col. 8, lines 36-62); and a fault isolation system that compares an inputted set of suspected faulty device features with the previously studied features listed in the defect table in order to identify causes of the fail (col. 10, lines 17-33 & col.13, lines 1-25). But Morioka et al. fails to disclose re-using the defected information stored in the defected table to diagnose a failure in an electronic device. However Gillenwater et al. discloses a real-time test controller for diagnostic devices during manufacturing processes. The real-time test controller maintains a failure database (item 40, Fig. 2) containing a history of past failures for

.

Application/Control Number: 10/709,672

Art Unit: 2138

Wednitor Namber, 107105,

devices under test and selectively sorts the history for the device to be tested (abstract).

Therefore at the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it

obvious to re-use the defected information stored in the defected table of Morioka et al.

to diagnose failures occurring in products under test in order to eliminate wasted time in

the testing process and to concentrate on known testing difficulties, thereby providing

the manufacturer, and ultimately the costumer, with a substantial savings (col. 3, lines

9-16; Gillenwater et al.).

Claims 2-6, 8, 11-13 and 17: Morioka et al. and Gillenwater et al. disclose a diagnosis

system as in claims 1, 9, and 15 above, wherein the previously studied features are

selected from the group consisting of: net names, instance names, cell names, physical

attributes, logical attributes, presence of a feature, and absence of a feature (col.20,

lines 45-67 & col. 11, lines 14-34; Morioka et al.).

Claims 7, 14, and 16: Morioka et al. and Gillenwater et al. disclose a diagnosis system

as in claims 1, 9, and 15 above, further comprising a table update system for

maintaining and updating the defect table (col. 23, lines 15-26, Fig. 30; Morioka et al.).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure:

Application/Control Number: 10/709,672 Page 4

Art Unit: 2138

a) Mizuno et al. (US 6757621) discloses a process management system for

inspecting defects on a wafer.

b) Koenig (US 6516433) discloses a method for finding the root cause of the

failure of a faulty chip.

c) Cheng et al. (US 20040210803 A1) discloses a built-in self-analyzer for

embedded memory.

d) Ogino (US 20040042293 A1) discloses a Semiconductor memory and method

of testing the same.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Exr. Merant Guerrier whose telephone number is (571)

270-1066. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 10:

30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

supervisor, Albert Decady, can be reached on (571) 272-3819. Draft or Informal faxes,

which will not be entered in the application, may be submitted directly to the examiner at

(571) 270-2066.

Merant Guerrier 11/27/06